



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

That such changes have not yet been appreciated by the profession is evidenced by late decisions of the Supreme Court dismissing writs of error for want of jurisdiction, with the remark that a writ of *certiorari* should have been requested.

For a discussion of these cases, see NOTES, p. 102.

FOREIGN CORPORATIONS — WHAT CONSTITUTES DOING BUSINESS WITHIN A STATE. — The defendant, a foreign railway corporation, had no property in Georgia but maintained a commercial agent there to solicit freight. He had no authority to make contracts. The plaintiff brought suit in Georgia for negligent injury that occurred in another state, and served the agent with process. *Held*, that the service was invalid. *De Bow v. Vicksburg S. & P. Ry.*, 98 S. E. 381 (Ga.).

No valid personal judgment can be rendered against a foreign corporation unless it is doing business within the state. *St. Clair v. Cox*, 106 U. S. 350; *Goldsey v. Morning News*, 156 U. S. 518. What acts constitute doing business are matters of fact, and it is difficult to find any helpful general criterion. However, acts done by agents who have authority to bind the corporation are considered to be a transaction of business. *Commercial Mutual Accident Co. v. Davis*, 213 U. S. 245. And, conversely, acts done by agents who have no authority to bind the corporation in any way have been held not to constitute doing business. *People's Tobacco Co. v. American Tobacco Co.*, 246 U. S. 79. *Cf. International Harvester Co. v. Kentucky*, 234 U. S. 579. Thus, it has been frequently decided that a foreign railway, having no lines within the state, is not doing business therein merely by maintaining an agent to solicit shippers. *Abraham Bros. v. Southern Ry. Co.*, 149 Ala. 547, 42 South. 837; *Booz v. Texas & P. Ry.*, 250 Ill. 376, 95 N. E. 460; *Green v. Chicago, B. & Q. Ry.*, 205 U. S. 530. It should be noted, however, that there has been suggested a doctrine that, for acquiring jurisdiction over a foreign corporation that does not expressly consent to the jurisdiction, the cause of action must have arisen within the state and out of the business therein transacted. *Simon v. Southern Ry. Co.*, 236 U. S. 115. See *Old Wayne Life Association v. McDonough*, 204 U. S. 8, 22. The principal case and most of the cases holding that mere soliciting is not doing business could on their facts have been decided on this ground. There seems to be no good reason why soliciting is insufficient to give the state jurisdiction over causes of action arising within the state and out of the soliciting. Where this question was squarely presented, this view has been taken. *Armstrong Co. v. New York Central & H. R. R. Co.*, 129 Minn. 104, 151 N. W. 917.

INJUNCTIONS — ACTS RESTRAINED — SUITS IN FOREIGN JURISDICTION IN EVASION OF THE DOMESTIC LAW. — The defendant, a citizen of Indiana, brought an action of tort against the complainant, a fellow citizen, in Illinois. After the Statute of Limitations had run on the cause of action in Indiana, the complainant filed his bill to enjoin the Illinois suit on the ground that he would be deprived of the defense of the statute in Illinois. *Held*, that the action be enjoined. *Culp v. Buller*, 122 N. E. (Ind.) 684.

For a discussion of the principles involved, see NOTES, p. 92.

INSURANCE — RIGHTS OF BENEFICIARY — COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS REGULATING CHANGE OF BENEFICIARY. — The beneficiary of a life certificate in a fraternal benefit association predeceased the insured. The latter took the certificate to the only representative of the association in the state and had him insert the name of a new beneficiary. A by-law of the association provided that a change of beneficiary would not be effective until the old policy had been surrendered and the executive committee had given its approval. Neither the insured nor the agent knew of this by-law. The insured died, and his